REMARKS

Claims 1-48 are pending in the present patent application. In the Examiner's Action dated January 19, 2000 (paper no. 7), the Examiner rejected claims 1-48. Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 17, 28, 43-44 and 47. Applicant respectfully requests examination and consideration of pending claims 1-48.

The Examiner has requested that the Applicant update the status of the related applications cited in pages 16, 22 and 24 of the specification. Applicant has amended the specification accordingly.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-25, 27-33 and 35-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by White et al. (U.S. Patent 5,983,273). The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 26 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over White. The Examiner states:

> White discloses a computing system comprising:
> (a)   a plurality of data service providers (4, fig. 1) coupled to an interconnect fabric (3, fig. 1) for providing data/services (see col. 3, lines 19-48),
> (b)   a proxy service (5, fig. 1) for providing user login service, maintaining user accounts, monitoring user sessions, processing user's requests and retrieving data from the data service providers for delivery to users in response to user's requests (see col. 5, lines 29-58),
> (c)   a stateless human interface device (1, fig. 1) comprising:
> (i)   input means for initiating a session and transmitting a request to the proxy service (see col. 4, lines 24-31),
> (ii)   means for receiving data from the proxy service,
> (iii)   means for displaying the received data (see col. 3, lines 51-67),
> (iv)   a smartcard device for providing unique user identification (see col. 4, lines 5-23).
> It is noted that an user login process usually requires a password.

83000.1013C/P3212C   6   EXPRESS MAIL #EL582495587US

...White does not teach using a biometric identifier to provide an unique user identification. An official notice is taken that the use of such biometric identifier is well-known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize any types of user identifiers to uniquely identify user in the log-in process.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant submits that White does not teach or suggest, let alone anticipate the present invention for at least the following reasons: White fails to anticipate, teach or suggest a stateless interface device; White fails to teach or suggest an active session associated with a user that is maintained when a user is disconnected from an interface device. These differences are discussed below.

White does not anticipate a stateless interface device as recited in independent claims 1, 10, 17, 28, 43-44 and 47, nor is such an element taught or suggested by White. In column 7, lines 24-40, for example, White discloses a process whereby a ticket is obtained by the WebTV box. This ticket is then submitted to WebTV servers when the WebTV box requests services. The WebTV box therefore maintains state in the form of a ticket. Further, in column 4, lines 59-67, White discloses the use of RAM and mass storage in the client system (i.e., the WebTV box) for state in the form of software or data. Applicant therefore submits that White does not anticipate, teach or suggest a stateless interface device.

White also does not anticipate, teach or suggest maintaining an active session when the user is disconnected. When discussing log-in procedures, White refers to *initiating* a user session (see column 8, lines 60-62). There is no

suggestion that a user session is maintained when the user removes his or her smart card, or otherwise disconnects, from the WebTV box, only the implication that a new session is initiated at each log-in. Therefore, Applicant submits that maintaining an active session associated with a user when that user is disconnected from an interface device is neither taught nor suggested by the cited art.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 10, 17, 28, 43-44 and 47 are allowable over the cited art. Further, claims 2-9, 11-16, 18-27, 29-42, 45-46 and 48, being dependent upon allowable base claims, are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons provided with respect to claims 1, 10, 17, 28, 43-44 and 47.

With respect to the Examiner's Official Notice, Applicant respectfully submits that the use of biometric identifiers within the context of the claimed invention is not well-known in the art. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide referential support for the asserted well-known use of biometric identifiers in a system as claimed. Further, Applicant objects to the notion that it would be obvious to utilize *any* types of user identifiers to uniquely identify user in the log-in process. Applicant submits that obvious types of identifiers must be alluded to in the references relied upon. The term "any" is overreaching, and would include types of identifiers yet to be conceived by man. Applicant therefore disagrees with the Examiner's statement regarding obviousness.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest, let alone anticipate, claims 1-48 of the present application. Claims 1-48 are therefore in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

THE HECKER LAW GROUP

Date: 6/30/2000

By: _Todd N. Snyder_
Todd N. Snyder
Reg. No. 41, 320

THE HECKER LAW GROUP
1925 Century Park East
Suite 2300
Los Angeles, California 90067
(310) 286-0377